

From: donkenney@compuserve.com@inetgw
To: microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov
Date: 1/26/02 5:36am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am merely a layperson and perhaps I misunderstand. I thought that the purpose of an antitrust settlement after the misbehavior of the defendant was determined, was to ensure that the defendant would go forth and sin no more. I must say that Microsoft does not seem to me to be a very repentant miscreant, and that -- given that Microsoft probably has no intention of giving up its monopolistic ways without a fight, the DOJ negotiated agreement appears to be utterly inadequate.

It appears to me that the agreement constitutes a summary of Microsoft's past anticompetitive practices and a collection of niggling legalisms that might -- on very good days -- prevent some of them from being repeated.

I would suggest that what is needed instead is a blanket prohibition on ANY practices that allow Microsoft to use its monopoly in the operating system market to further ANY non-OS Microsoft corporate activity of any sort. This should be coupled with effective enforcement mechanisms and draconian financial penalties for transgressions.

I would suggest that any settlement that falls short of that level will merely lead to another trial, another conviction and another settlement a few years downstream.

Why not do the job properly now?

Donald Kenney